



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/803,029	03/17/2004	Anthony Cake	455610-2490.2	5619
20999	7590	06/22/2005	EXAMINER	
FROMMERM LAWRENCE & HAUG 745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL. NEW YORK, NY 10151			BLACKMAN, ANTHONY J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2676	
DATE MAILED: 06/22/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/803,029	CAKE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	ANTHONY J. BLACKMAN	2676

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 April 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 53-77 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-52 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 53-77 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 July 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/16/04</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant describes the primary reference of ZINK et al, US Patent No. 6,738,964, as a graphical solutions development system (gsds) providing a controlling, connecting and design environment for hardware simulation. To overcome ZINK et al, Applicant provides the following highlighted claim language, “**for implementation and control of said processing apparatus**” for software control of a hardware system in a user-controlled environment. Examiner agrees with applicant that ZINK et al no longer anticipates the invention with the added claim language above. However, JUNDT et al, US Patent No. 6,618,630, combines with ZINK et al to teach the at least amended claim limitation above. JUNDT et al teaches implementation and control of a processing apparatus (col 9, line 61- col 10, line 8) that is implemented on software, firmware or hardware and col 2, lines 51-60 discloses process control network in addition to teaching the following cited amended claim language, An editor for modifying a processing sequence for **implementation and control of a processing apparatus** and whereby said processing sequence **for implementation and control of a processing apparatus** is modified in accordance with the editing of said at least one processing element.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 53 and 56-77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ZINK et al, US Patent No. 6,738,964 in view of JUNDT et al , US Patent No. 6,618,630.

4. As per claim 53, examiner interprets ZINK et al to disclose An editor for modifying a processing sequence (column 7, lines 50-57) by editing the configuration of a processing web (column 6, lines 12-24), comprising:

means for determining a current state of said processing web (the component creator determines the state/what properties will be included in a component, whether the properties can be modified and when the properties are accessible- column 7, lines 50-57 and figure 23 illustrates how a script may query the environment to achieve a particular result is equivalent to the feature as claimed - see column 24, lines 36-67), including one or more processing elements and connections there between in said processing web (the component assembly tool performs editing and the components and blocks are equivalent to processors - column 6, lines 12-24); and

a selector for selecting and editing at least one of said processing elements of said processing web (the component assembly tool 507 performs editing and the components and blocks are equivalent to processors performing the function as recited in the claim language - see the drag and drop means is equivalent to selecting and editing means - column 6, lines 12-24);

whereby said processing is modified in accordance with the editing of said at least one processing element. JUNDT et al teaches implementation and control of a processing apparatus (col 9, line 61- col 10, line 8) that is implemented on software, firmware or hardware and col 2, lines 51-60 discloses process control network in addition to teaching the following cited amended claim language, An editor for modifying a processing sequence for implementation and control of a processing apparatus and whereby said processing sequence for implementation and control of a processing apparatus is modified in accordance with the editing of said at least one processing element. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use the "user interface for use in a process control network coupled top a workstation that includes a processor, a memory and a display (see col 2, lines 53-59) as the controller implements at least a portion of the process control solution (see col 2, lines 53-56) that may be implemented in various ways for user convenience, i.e., (see col 9, line 61-col 10, line 8, for use in alternative implementations other than a workstation, such as hardware, firmware, specialized circuits, etc., as well as software, including any computer readable memory of JUNDT et al to modify the user operated graphical

solutions development system of ZINK et al because both inventions are user-interface-software oriented processor controlling systems.

5. As per claim 56, ZINK et al as modified meet limitations of claim 53, including, wherein said editing of said at least one processing element includes changing a connection of at least one pin of said at least one processing element (column 20, lines 19-29).

6. As per claim 57, ZINK et al as modified meet limitations of claim 53, wherein said editing of said at least one processing element includes adding another processing element to said processing web (is equivalent to the component creator adding at least event inputs and event outputs - see column 20, lines 19-29).

7. As per claim 58, Zink et al as modified meet limitations of claim 57, including, wherein said another processing element is added to said processing web by dragging a representation of said processing element onto a display representative of said processing web (column 6, lines 12-24), and connecting inputs and outputs of said another processing element to the inputs and outputs of other existing processing elements (column 20, lines 19-29).

8. As per claim 59, ZINK et al as modified meet limitations of claim 53, including, wherein said editing of said at least one processing element includes modifying the definition thereof (the component assembly tool 507 comprises a

drag and drop means to facilitate "component assembly"/editing/modifying and further, the component creator, see column 7, lines 50-57, also determines what properties will be included, whether they can be modified, and when they are accessible provides an equivalent to modifying the definition).

9. As per claim 60, Zink et al as modified meet limitations of claim 59, wherein modifying the definition of said at least one processing element includes modifying one or more operating parameters thereof (the component assembly tool 507 comprises a drag and drop means to facilitate "component assembly"/editing/modifying and further, the component creator, see column 7, lines 50-57, also determines what properties will be included, whether they can be modified, and when they are accessible provides an equivalent to modifying at least one of the parameters).

10. As per claim 61, ZINK et al as modified meet limitations of claim 53, further comprising a viewing element being added to said processing web to view a live, real time output at the location of said viewing element (see the Data viewer applets - column 6, lines 42-53).

11. As per claim 62, examiner interprets Zink et al to meet limitations for A processing web editor for modifying a processing sequence for implementation and control of a processing apparatus (column 7, lines 50-

57) by editing a graphical representation of a processing (column 6, lines 12-24), comprising:

means for determining a current state of said processing web for implementation and control of a processing apparatus (the component creator determines the state column 7, lines 50-57 and figure 23 illustrates how a script may query the environment to

achieve a particular result is equivalent to the feature as claimed - see column 24, lines 36-67);

a renderer for generating a graphical representation of said processing web for implementation and control of a processing apparatus (is equivalent to the

"offering the user a graphical drawing environment - column 6, lines 19-24) by:

determining a first processing element of said processing web (figure 9, element 1001 is the first of many connective blocks equivalent to processing elements, see column 8, line 38-column 9, line 9);

placing said first processing element (figure 9, element 1001 is equivalent to a processing element) in a particular location based at least

in part upon its location in said processing web and various inputs to and outputs

from said first processing element/figure 9, element 1001 (placement is inherent as with figure 9, element 1001 and element 1002 and so on- column 8, line 38-column 9, line 9);

determining a second processing element of said processing web figure (figure 9, element 102 persuant to element 1001 see - column 8, line 38-

column 9, line 9); placing said second processing element in a particular

location based at

least in part upon its location in said processing web)placement is inherent as with figure 9, element 1001 and 1002 and so on - column 8, line 38-column 9, line 9), various inputs to and outputs from said second processing element (column 8, line 38column 9, line 9, including figure 8a that shows "various inputs and outputs"), and a relationship between said second processing element and said first processing element

(figure 9, elements 1001 and 1002 represent separate processors

(claimed) and connective blocks, see - column 8, line 38-column 9, line

9), and

connecting at least one pin of said first processing element to one pin of

said second processing element (this feature is inherent between elements 1001 and 1002 and supported by figures 8a-8d), and

a selector for selecting and editing at least one processing element of said processing web (the component assembly tool 507 performs editing and the components and blocks are equivalent to processors performing the function as recited in the claim language - see the drag and drop means is equivalent to selecting and editing means - column 6, lines 12-24);

whereby said processing sequence for implementation and control of a processing apparatus is modified in accordance with the editing of said at least one processing element (column 6, lines 12-24), however, ZINK et al does not expressly teach the means for for implementation and control of a processing apparatus. Conversely, JUNDT et al, teach implementation and control of a

processing apparatus (col 9, line 61- col 10, line 8) that is implemented on software, firmware or hardware and col 2, lines 51-60 discloses process control network and col 9, lines 42-60 display means that allows the user to view and access current information such as status, i.e., implementation and control of a processing apparatus related to the following claim limitations; A processing web editor for modifying a processing sequence for implementation and control of a processing apparatus;

means for determining a current state of said processing web for implementation and control of a processing apparatus:

a renderer for generating a graphical representation of said processing web for implementation and control of a processing apparatus; and whereby said processing sequence for implementation and control of a processing apparatus is modified in accordance with the editing of said at least one processing element.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use the "user interface for use in a process control network coupled top a workstation that includes a processor, a memory and a display (see col 2, lines 53-59) as the controller implements at least a portion of the process control solution (see col 2, lines 53-56) that may be implemented in various ways for user convenience, i.e., (see col 9, line 61-col 10, line 8, for use in alternative implementations other than a workstation, such as hardware, firmware, specialized circuits, etc., as well as software, including any computer readable

memory of JUNDT et al to modify the user operated graphical solutions development system of ZINK et al because both inventions are user-interface-software oriented processor controlling systems.

12. As pert claim 63, ZINK et al as modified meet limitations of claim 62, including, wherein a list of available processing elements (components are equivalent to the processing elements provided by the component gallery 503) is provided (column 5, lines 47-61).

13. As per claim 64, ZINK et al as modified meet limitations of claim 63, including, wherein these processing elements are categorized (see sorting means for component gallery 503) by function (see sorting components based on user-defined preferences for component gallery 503- column 5, lines 47-61).

14. As per claim 65, ZINK et al as modified meet limitations of claim 62, including, wherein upon selection of a processing element allows for the modifying of any parameter (see user-defined preferences for component gallery 503) regarding said selected processing element (column 5, lines 47-61).

15. As per claim 66, examiner interprets ZINK et al to disclose An editor for modifying a processing sequence (column 7, lines 50-57) by editing the configuration of a processing web (column 6, lines 12-24), comprising:

means for determining a current state of said processing web(the component creator determines the state/what properties will be included in a component, whether the properties can be modified and when the properties are accessible- column 7, lines 5057 and figure 23 illustrates how a script may query the environment to achieve a particular result is equivalent to the feature as claimed - see column 24, lines 36-67), including one or more processing elements and connections there between in said processing web(the component assembly tool performs editing and the components and blocks are equivalent to processors - column 6, lines 12-24); and

a selector for selecting and editing at least one connection between said processing elements of said processing web(the component assembly tool 507 performs editing and the components and blocks are equivalent to processors performing the function as recited in the claim language - see the drag and drop means is equivalent to selecting and editing means - column 6, lines 12-24);

whereby said processing sequence is modified in accordance with the editing of said at least one connection (the component assembly tool 507 performs editing and the components and blocks are equivalent to processors performing the function as recited in the claim language - see the drag and drop means is equivalent to selecting and editing means - column 6, lines 12-24. For further support of editing/modifying at least one connection refer to adding pins to the component - see column 20, lines 19-29). However, ZINK et al does not expressly teach the following added claim language in connection with any

system processes "for implementation and control of said processing apparatus".

Conversely, JUNDT et al, teach implementation and control of a processing apparatus (col 9, line 61- col 10, line 8) that is implemented on software, firmware or hardware and col 2, lines 51-60 discloses process control network and col 9, lines 42-60 display means that allows the user to view and access current information such as status, i.e., implementation and control of a processing apparatus related to the following claim limitations;

An editor for modifying a processing sequence for implementation and control of a processing apparatus: and

whereby said processing sequence for implementation and control of a processing apparatus is modified in accordance with the editing of said at least one connection.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use the "user interface for use in a process control network coupled top a workstation that includes a processor, a memory and a display (see col 2, lines 53-59) as the controller implements at least a portion of the process control solution (see col 2, lines 53-56) that may be implemented in various ways for user convenience, i.e., (see col 9, line 61-col 10, line 8, for use in alternative implementations other than a workstation, such as hardware, firmware, specialized circuits, etc., as well as software, including any computer readable memory of JUNDT et al to modify the user operated graphical solutions development system of ZINK et al because both inventions are user-interface-software oriented processor controlling systems.

16. As per claim 67, ZINK et al meet as modified limitations of claim 66, wherein when said at least one connection is requested to be edited, a determination is made whether said processing elements to be connected by said at least one connection are compatible (see column 4, lines 34-53 - discusses interconnecting components for the Graphical solutions development system 500 of FIG. 5 to be combined with (see column 5, lines 29-46) the compatibility connection means by the component publisher 501 of the Graphical solutions development system 500. (column 5, lines 29-46); FIG. 7 provides an overall block diagram of graphical solutions development system 500. Because the ultimate goal is to provide the user with a powerful graphical design capability based on pre-engineered components, the initial task is to provide the ability to create compatible components. The component publisher 501 is an applet designed to create fully compatible components 502. The component publisher 501 creates a sequence of dialog windows (i.e. a wizard) that is designed to gather relevant information from the user regarding the component being published. Information supplied by the component creator may include the name of the component, the date of publication, the revision number, resources that need to be included to assure primary functionality, interfaces, and

other miscellaneous items. When the dialog with the user is completed, component publisher 501 employs a standardized formatting procedure to package all of the information and resources into a single convenient file.

17. As per claim 68, ZINK et al as modified meet limitation of claim 67, including, wherein if it is determined that said processing elements are compatible and of the same format, the connection is made (see column 23, line 51-column 24, line 35. The graphical solutions development system (GSDS) scripting (program language/scripts) delivers format processing required for subsequent processing operations (column 23, lines 51-60) and GSDS includes wire and pin connection means between components/blocks/ processors - column 23, lines 61-column 24, line 5) and column 24, lines 25-35 discuss how to pass data or events from one component to another through improvement in the scripts).

18. As per claim 69, ZINK et al as modified meet limitations of claim 67, wherein if it is determined that said processing elements are compatible but of different formats, an

adapter is automatically inserted between the processing elements (It is inherent that the GSDS scripting means discussed provides compatible format processing as claimed -see - column 24, lines 25-35. Further, the script processing created by a component designer (see column 24, lines 25-35) provides the functional equivalence to the adapter means).

19. As per claim 70, ZINK et al as modified, meet limitations of claim 69, including, wherein said adapter comprises a plurality of processing elements. Referring to the GSDS script processing means of column 23, line 51- column 24, line 35, it is inherent that the script processing created by a component designer (see column 24, lines 25-35) provides the functional equivalence to the adapter means comprising a plurality of elements. Accordingly, this feature as recited in the claim language is not novel and or unique.

20. As per claim 71, ZINK et al as modified meet limitations of claim 67, wherein if it is determined that said processing elements are not compatible, a connection is not made there between (see column 18, lines 7-29.; it is inherent that within the filtering capabilities of the GSDS component gallery providing a listing of the components that will only (column 18, lines 13-14 and 22-26, wherein, only is underlined and highlighted for emphasis to show that a connection will not be made when if it is determined that said processing elements are not compatible).

21. As per claim 72, examiner interprets ZINK et al as modified to disclose

A[n] method for modifying a processing sequence (column 7, lines 50-57) by editing the configuration of a processing web (column 6, lines 12-24), comprising the steps of:

determining a current state of said processing web (the component creator determines the state/what properties will be included in a component, whether the properties can be modified and when the properties are accessible-column 7, lines 50-57 and figure 23 illustrates how a script may query the environment to achieve a particular result is equivalent to the feature as claimed - see column 24, lines 36-67), including one or more processing elements and connections there between in said processing web (the component assembly tool performs editing and the components and blocks are equivalent to processors - column 6, lines 12-24); and

selecting and editing at least one connection between said processing elements of said processing web (the component assembly tool 507 performs editing and the components and blocks are equivalent to processors performing the function as recited in the claim language - see the drag and drop means is equivalent to selecting and editing means - column 6, lines 12-24);

whereby said processing sequence is modified in accordance with the editing of said at least one connection (the component assembly tool 507 performs editing and the components and blocks are equivalent to processors performing the function as recited in the claim language - see the drag and drop means is equivalent to selecting and editing means - column 6, lines 12-24. For further

support of editing/modifying at least one connection refer to adding pins to the component - see column 20, lines 19-29). However, ZINK et al does not expressly teach the following added claim language in connection with any system processes "for implementation and control of said processing apparatus".

Conversely, JUNDT et al, teach implementation and control of a processing apparatus (col 9, line 61- col 10, line 8) that is implemented on software, firmware or hardware and col 2, lines 51-60 discloses process control network and col 9, lines 42-60 display means that allows the user to view and access current information such as status, i.e., implementation and control of a processing apparatus related to the following claim limitations;

A method for modifying a processing sequence for implementation and control of a processing apparatus: and

determining a current state of said processing web for implementation and control of a processing apparatus;

whereby said processing sequence for implementation and control of a processing apparatus is modified in accordance with the editing of said at least one connection.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use the "user interface for use in a process control network coupled top a workstation that includes a processor, a memory and a display (see col 2, lines 53-59) as the controller implements at least a portion of the process control solution (see col 2, lines 53-56) that may be implemented in various ways for user convenience, i.e., (see col 9, line 61-col 10, line 8, for use in alternative

implementations other than a workstation, such as hardware, firmware, specialized circuits, etc., as well as software, including any computer readable memory of JUNDT et al to modify the user operated graphical solutions development system of ZINK et al because both inventions are user-interface-software oriented processor controlling systems.

22. As per claim 73, the recited claim language of claims 73 and 67 are substantially similar.

23. As per claim 74, the recited claim language of claims 74 and 68 are substantially similar.

24. As per claim 75, the recited claim language of claims 75 and 69 are substantially similar.

25. As per claim 76, the recited claim language of claims 76 and 70 are substantially similar.

26. As per claim 77, the recited claim language of claims 77 and 71 are substantially similar.

27. **Claims 54 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zink et al, US Patent No. 6,738,964 in view of JUNDT et al, US Patent No. 6,618,630 further in view of WILSON et al, US Patent No. 5,400,246.**

28. As per claim 54, ZINK et al as modified meet limitations of claim 53, however, does not expressly teach wherein said editor edits said first processing element to

indicate an update indicating a time during which said first processing element is to

consume additional input data/updating the values. WILSON at least suggests further

comprising the step of said first processing element indicating a time during which

said first processing element is to consume additional input data/updating the values

(column 30, lines 3-22 and 38-51 indicate current status means). It would have been

obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the following features and limitations;

"In review, it can now be seen that the present invention provides a peripheral data acquisition, monitor, and adaptive control system which allows the user to easily create, modify, and test complex control system configurations on a personal computer. The program can be configured to orient the user with respect to the physical location and function of the equipment being controlled by the system column 35, lines 9-16" of WILSON et al to modify the hardware and software graphical solutions development system of ZINK et al because WILSON et al's "...adaptive control system which allows the user to easily create, modify, and test complex control system configurations on a personal computer (column 35, lines 9-16) providing greater user operability and control in monitoring the development system of ZINK et al. Therefore,

it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify ZINK et al with WILSON et al.

29. As per claim 55, ZINK et al as modified meet limitations and features of claim 54, however, does not expressly teach wherein said update is controlled by an update

processing element. WILSON et al at least suggest wherein said update is controlled

by an update processing element (column 30, lines 3-22 and 38-51 indicate current

status means discuss the means of an update processing element that bears similar

results to the recited claim language). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the

art at the time of the invention to utilize the following features and limitations;

"In review, it can now be seen that the present invention provides a peripheral data acquisition, monitor, and adaptive control system which allows the user to easily create, modify, and test complex control system configurations on a personal computer. The program can be configured to orient the user with respect to the physical location and function of the equipment being controlled by the system column 35, lines 9-16" of WILSON et al to modify the hardware and software graphical solutions development system of ZINK et al because WILSON et al's "...adaptive control system which allows the user to easily create, modify, and test complex control system configurations on a personal computer (column 35, lines 9-16)

providing greater user operability and control in monitoring the development system of ZINK et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify ZINK et al with WILSON et al.

Conclusion

30. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANTHONY J BLACKMAN whose telephone

number is 571-272-7779. The examiner can normally be reached on FLEX SCHEDULE.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MATTHEW BELLA can be reached on 571-272-7778. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


ANTHONY J BLACKMAN Examiner
Art Unit 2676


Matthew C. Bella

MATTHEW C. BELLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600